



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE TIME ELEMENT IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS.

POLITICAL campaigns are processes of collective psychology. In the choice of their officers and policies the people deliberate and decide. These two essentials are worthy of study, each in itself, each in its relations to the other. At one end of political evolution, the African selects his chief by the chance spinning of a cocoanut; at the other, the Anglo-Saxon fills many months with alternate hustings and ballotings. Deliberation is a fermentation; decision is a crystallization. Time is the basis for both, but inversely. Opinion, in the forming, suffers less from slowness than from rashness. With a turning and a returning, the subject of thought freely presents every possible side. But the close, the determination, demands precision, regularity, and swiftness. The fruitful inquiry belongs not to the child, but to the philosopher; the admirable action, not to the clown, but to the athlete. Above all, the halting decision and the broken train of reasoning are deplorable; the two ought to be kept sharply distinct, each in its proper place.

In the development of our American methods for choosing public servants these principles have played an improving part. One hundred years ago the idea of a definite legal hour and minute for the opening, and a definite legal hour and minute for the closing, of the polls was scarcely known. A fire, an attack by Indians, or the tardiness of a moderator might delay the start of a town election. The judgment of the presiding selectmen determined when it should close. Philadelphia or Boston could transact the entire business in three or four hours, but rural regions often required as many as five days. In 1789 the New Jersey polls were open for three weeks. As in electing, so in nominating, extreme irregularity prevailed. From the moment that the people began to think of candidates, the process of nomination was continuous and confused. Everybody could nominate. Every day and every hour was in order. By private

letter-writing, by newspaper tickets, by numerous petty caucuses of undefined membership, and by straggling conventions that were but imperfectly representative, the names of the candidates were presented up to the very night before the balloting was to begin.

Out of these primary forms a system has arisen, which now gathers all the caucuses for a county or for a state within the bounds of a single day, substitutes for a dozen conventions of the same party a single convention, and chooses all the members of a national Congress within a rising and setting of the sun. The average American of today thinks of political action in three successive stages—the primary, the convention, the election. The comparatively lengthy periods between and preceding these he assigns to the deliberative processes of the people. He takes that ancient word “campaign” that has echoed the measured tread of armies for two thousand years, and applies it to the movement of democracy.

But with all of a century’s advance, the process of time regulation is incomplete. My object is to make clear this imperfection, to show the abuses therefrom resulting, and to suggest lines of further progress.

Until recently the universal authority for fixing the dates of primaries and conventions has been the party central committee. This committee is not a single central authority. The name is legion. In all the United States, from Sandy Hook to No Man’s Land, the ward, or town, or city, or precinct, or county, or assembly district, or congressional district, or state, is rare that has not from one to half a dozen central committees. Each party has three grades of them—national, state, and county. The subordination of the lower to the higher committee, very loose in general, is especially so on the score of the times for political action. The presidential year affords a complete study of these time relations. Custom, or party rule, requires the national committee to meet and decide the date of the national convention at least six months in advance of the convention’s assemblage. This gives for the primaries and the minor conventions a period of half a year or longer. No sooner has the

national committee set definite bounds to the period—which it usually does at Washington in the December or January preceding the election—than the central committee, in any one of the forty-five states of the union, is at liberty to fix the date of its state convention. This date may be within a month, or may be five months, from the receipt of the national call. Of the Republican state conventions in 1896 the first met in Arkansas, March 3; the last, in Idaho, May 16. Fourteen were held in March, eighteen in April, and thirteen in May. The first three were those of Arkansas, Mississippi, and Florida; the last five, those of Washington, Colorado, Wyoming, North Carolina, and Idaho. Of the Democratic state conventions in the same year, the first met in Oregon, April 10; the last, in Georgia, June 25. Twelve were held in April, seven in May, and twenty-five in June. The first five were west, and the last five east, of the Mississippi river.

The action of the state committee in setting the time for the state convention fixed, in the next place, the outer time limits for the county conventions. If the state committee has granted a latitude of four months, and the state has ninety counties, each of the ninety central committees of these counties may choose a separate day for its county convention. In their haste, a few counties may hold conventions before the state committee has issued its call, afterward adjusting their representation by dropping surplus delegates from their lists. The Illinois county conventions of 1896 extended all the way from January 27, the day before the state committee's call, to April 26, four days before the meeting of the state convention. So, last of all, as each county committee decides the date of the county convention, more or less play is often given to the committees of the towns, or wards, or precincts, for fixing the times of their primaries.

Such have been the general order and conditions of the time game that I am to describe. The infinite number of authorities has meant an infinite variety of practice, and an infinite opportunity for sharp play. Within the limits, the machine of each locality selects for action that date which it deems most advantageous for itself, as against the machines of other political areas. The variety of motive and result can be appreciated only by

mounting in turn the separate pinnacles of the national, the state, and the county politician.

Let a county central committee have attained a state of "harmony" concerning the party candidates to be put into the field for the county offices. It is then impelled to call the county convention upon as short notice as possible, in order to forestall the public opinion of the county. Its "slate" is ready, its delegates in the various precincts are carefully selected; they may all be foisted upon the people by quick, well-concerted action, before the people make up their minds whom or what they want. But the selfish county committee may also be very much alive to the opportunities for the state offices and privileges. Upon this score, an early county convention secures the advantage of the "moral effect," the imitative tendency so strong in human nature. "There is a contagion in example which few men have the force to resist," said Alexander Hamilton. The county that anticipates other counties in pledging itself to a particular aspirant for a given office, say the state-treasurership, starts a "boom" for its favorite. The county that publishes the earliest instructions relative to the state platform furnishes a model for tardier county declarations. The first Republican county convention of Illinois for 1896, held at Olney, January 27, instructed for the gold standard and named William McKinley for president, William E. Mason for senator, and John R. Tanner for governor. The complete fulfillment of this forecast was not altogether a coincidence.

If a candidate secures early conventions friendly to himself in several counties, the "moral effect" of his success is all the greater, as the delegates so early won are the more numerous. He gains even weightier vantage where he early captures a single county that contains a great metropolis. Cities are much more favorable to expeditious and unified action than are rural regions. The main political advantage of the city over the country lies in its special opportunities for association on a large numerical scale.

But county machines sometimes call late conventions. Under the Australian ballot, nominations by petition must be filed a

certain number of days before the election. The county central committees may make such petitioning—as a protest against their nominees—difficult, or even impossible, by holding late conventions, and will do so where the spirit of independent voting threatens their power. Again, if a wise county finds itself feeble or entirely wanting in “timber” for the elective offices, it may aim to secure the appointive offices of the state. To this end it holds off until the seasonable hour, or, it may be, until the last moment. If a point is reached, before the state convention has met, where the statistics from the other counties indicate that this particular county can wield the balance of power, then its convention meets and pledges its delegates in return for the larger promises of patronage incident to such a critical time. If the statistics of instruction from the other counties leave the outcome doubtful up to the very eve of the state convention, the said county chooses at the eleventh hour unpledged delegates, who freely exercise their diplomatic talents in the hotel lobbies and headquarters at the state gathering.

The best recent example of a successful use of all the time conditions by a single county containing a vast city in a populous commonwealth is afforded in the election of John R. Tanner to the governorship of Illinois. For this office three or four other prominent Republicans of the Prairie State had set their caps as early as had Mr. Tanner. But he had transferred his residence, from the southern portion of Illinois to the county in which Chicago is situated, the great county of Cook. Himself the chairman of the Republican state central committee, he had cultivated the acquaintance and won the alliance of the leading spirits in the Cook county Republican central committee. Together, therefore, shortly after the call of the national committee for the St. Louis convention, they outlined their plan. They would issue the call for the state convention on the twenty-eighth of January, the day after the county convention at Olney should have declared for Mr. Tanner. They would issue the call for the Cook county convention on the fourth of February. They would hold the county primaries on the fourteenth of February, and the county convention on the fifteenth. With but a week elapsed, the county

committeemen of the powerful and alert central region of the state, and of the remoter Egypt, would scarcely have received the state committee's call before the Cook county committee had acted. With but ten days' notice for the Cook county primaries, the citizens of Chicago—who since then have become exceedingly unfriendly to Governor Tanner, and at that time knew little about him—would be taken unawares, and before they had entertained a thought of the coming election. Secondary to these motives of gaining the time vantage in the state and county fields, the county politicians of Cook were anxious to avoid complications with national politics, for the rich prize of Chicago was already becoming a bone of contention among the presidential aspirants.

Accordingly, by a secret caucus on the third of February, they put the finishing touches upon their county slate, and on the next day issued their call. The lusty outcry of the city newspapers availed nothing. Neither did a denunciatory mass-meeting assembled February 10, on the ringing appeal of a score of the city's most prominent Republicans. The "snap" time schedule succeeded. At once the men who planned it found themselves in control of Cook county's delegation to the state convention; that is, of more than one-fourth of the convention's membership; or, to be exact, of 372 delegates, where the rest of the state was entitled to 963. Of the one hundred and one other counties no one was entitled to more than twenty-seven delegates. This capture of Cook practically ended the contest of the aspirants for the state offices, for, to go back still earlier, these same Cook county managers had, in November, 1895, entered into a conditional alliance with Egypt. They had gone on a railway pilgrimage, had skirted the broad central part of Illinois, had crossed the Mississippi into St. Louis. There they had met one hundred and more Republican politicians of southern Illinois, a section where the petty local manager of both parties yet rules in the old-time satrapic splendor of Jacksonian days. They had pledged the fealty of the hungry Egyptians by dazzling promises of patronage. So, after the Cook county convention, the "moral effect" had its fullest sway. The home stronghold

of the other gubernatorial candidates, the great central prairie region, the strength and hope of the commonwealth, was crushed as between the upper and nether millstones. One by one its counties fell helplessly into line with pledges for the Cook county slate. One by one the other gubernatorial aspirants withdrew their names. Two weeks before the farcical state convention Mr. Tanner predicted his nomination with absolute certainty.

From the standpoint of the county committee one should proceed to the standpoint of the state committee. This body, too, may plan to forestall public opinion. By calling an early state convention it may anticipate the preferences of the people, both as to state candidates and issues and as to national candidates and issues. With regard to the state offices, it may work in thorough accord with one or more county machines against the others. The above case of Illinois is in point.

But in a presidential year the state committee fixes the date of the state convention with an eye mainly to national politics. Its relations with the inferior county central committees are strongly overshadowed by its relations with the coequal central committees of the forty-five other states. Here the play of motives leading to the earlier or the later convention is very similar to that which has been described for the relations of the county committees to each other. Some difference between the state and national fields may possibly be ascribed to the difference between their relative numbers of elective and appointive offices. The state executive has numerous elective offices, while the national executive has but two. With due allowance for recent effects of the civil-service laws, the appointive patronage of the nation is relatively more important than that of a state. Therefore only a few state committees have in view the presidency and the vice-presidency, and the great majority are seeking the presidential appointments — the collectorships, the consulships, or the cabinet seats. The strong, *bona fide* aspirant for the presidency works for the advantage of the "moral effect" by securing an early convention in his own state, and in any other state whose machine may be friendly to his nomination. So much the more fortunate is he in securing the first state that

instructs, if that state has many delegates. Delaware were nothing beside Pennsylvania. States that do not expect to furnish the presidential candidate follow various policies. Southern Republican committees seem to favor early conventions and early understandings with presidential aspirants, wishing, perhaps, to forestall competition with states of stronger influence. A large state often puts off its decision to the last, with a view to exercising the balance of power. This it can accomplish, even with an early convention. If a powerful boss has the state well in hand, he calls an early state convention, and compels it to indorse a puppet presidential candidate, a "favorite son," so-called. By this course he excludes the genuine aspirants, who are making inroads into his preserves, holds the state delegation together until the national convention meets, and then casts its solid vote for whom he will. The Empire State is, of course, the historic ambush ground of "snappers." Roscoe Conkling set a Republican precedent by his convention of February 25, 1880. Twelve years later David B. Hill secured the Democratic delegation, though the real choice of the New York Democracy would have been ex-President Cleveland. The dates of that rapid action tell the story without comment. January 21, 1892, the Democratic national committee issued its call for the national convention of the twenty-first of June. Five days later, January 26, the New York state central committee called the Democratic state convention for February 22. Thus but four weeks were given to party deliberation, where twenty were available. The earliest previous date of a Democratic state convention, April 21, shows the radicalness of this action. County and town committees were correspondingly snappish, and many primaries were held upon but a day's imperfect notice.

Such is the play of advantage within the party. But also, a party's committee fixes the dates of its action with reference to the dates selected by opposing political committees. The committees of parties out of power may favor late conventions in the hope that the party in power will meanwhile make some mistake or meet with some misfortune in the conduct of government.

The politicians of the party that acts later regulate its course according to the course of the party that acts earlier. If one party presents a bad candidate or a platform of glittering generalities, the other may do likewise with impunity. If one party declares for a certain course, the other may make an issue, often exceedingly artificial, by declaring for the very opposite course.

All these motives have worked for variety and irregularity in the times of political action. But opposed to them has been a tendency marked throughout the long history of elective government. It is the trend toward a uniform and intelligently planned time schedule for elections. Its presence is traceable even in the colonial laws of America, notably in those of New England. The constitutional convention of 1787 took, for the day, advanced ground in recognition of time uniformity and periodicity. It fixed the first Monday in December for the regular annual meeting of Congress. It prescribed one and the same day for the meeting of the electors of president and vice-president in all the states. Above all, it made possible further uniform prescriptions as to national elections, by vesting in Congress a supplemental or supervisory power over them.

In exercise of this power Congress passed the law of 1792, which required the presidential electors to be chosen at least thirty-four days before the first Wednesday in December, the date fixed by the same act for their meeting. This was the only congressional regulation until 1845. With this slight limitation, each state, during the first half century of the union, named its presidential electors and congressmen on such days as it might please. The confusion that resulted is epitomized in the proverb of 1825 and onward: "As goes Pennsylvania, so goes the union." To this proverb Ohio and Maine have successively fallen heir. The earlier election in the populous Keystone State influenced unduly the later elections in the other states. With the invention and introduction of the telegraph and the railroad, the evil was accentuated until it became intolerable. To it, as population grew, was added another evil; namely, the migration of voters from one state to another. Having voted at his

home election, the faithful Whig or Democrat of the border crossed the line to assist at the later election in an adjoining commonwealth. In 1844 Alexander Duncan, a representative from Ohio, who claimed to have suffered severely from this pipe-laying, introduced into the national house a bill which provided for the choice of all presidential electors and congressmen upon the same day. He selected the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, possibly for climatic considerations, possibly to avoid the times of state elections. New York was the only state that chose state officers on that date. The states-rights sentiment of the time could not go quite so far, and the law as finally enacted, January 23, 1845, applied only to the presidential electors. It gradually induced the several states to fix the same date for the election of congressmen and of state officers. By so doing, they saved time and expense. The public mind was therefore educated to the idea of uniformity. The Civil War broke down the jealousy of national regulation which had preserved the subject of elections to the sphere of statehood. For these reasons, in 1872, Benjamin F. Butler could, and did, secure, without serious opposition, the enactment of that part of Alexander Duncan's bill which had failed in 1844; namely, the choice of all the national representatives upon the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November.

Probably these legislators thought little of the ultimate effects of their laws. Only now, for one thing, are we beginning to see that a uniform time for the final election has been operating strongly for uniform times of the conventions and of the primaries. Here and there new party rules and new state laws are regulating action more pronouncedly. Mr. Josiah Quincy asserts that "neither party can afford to come very far behind its opponent in the matter of the date of making nominations." In a recent contest the Populist county conventions in seventy of the one hundred counties of Kansas were held on the same day. Tuesday has become "election day" even for state and municipal elections held on other days than the national November date. More than one hundred cities and towns of Illinois hold their spring elections on the same April Tuesday. The primary

laws recently passed in several states show a notable appreciation of time uniformity. Kentucky's law of 1892 operates to the holding of all the primaries and all the county conventions of any given party upon the same days. The Massachusetts caucus act of 1895 provides a two-days' period for all the caucuses of a given party throughout the state. The California law of 1897 and the New York law of 1898 mark the logical goal by prescribing the same fixed date for all the primaries of all parties.

I have referred to the fact that state and national elections were formerly held on separate days to a greater extent than now. The topic of distinct times for national, state, and municipal elections ranks as the second main division of my subject. Elections for the superior and inferior governments are not mixed in other lands as in ours. On this score Mr. Lusk has contrasted the Australian methods with the American. The politics of Massachusetts in 1804 illustrate our purest primitive practice. In that year the selectmen of Boston were chosen on the nineteenth of March; the governor, lieutenant-governor, and council, on the second of April; the members of the general court, on the ninth of May; the presidential electors and congressmen, on the fifth of November—at least four elections within eight months. But, from the beginning of its history, the nation's growth and its absorbing private pursuits have powerfully urged the various states to get through with all the elections of a year at a stroke. Mr. Butler's law of 1872 encouraged the tendency. After that statute had converted the great majority of the states to the national election day for the choice of their state officers, the few lingering "October states" came under the powerful duress of the corruption and demoralization due to the more concentrated efforts of national political parties to secure the "moral effect" of their state elections. Therefore, the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November has become the almost universal time for the choice of both state and national officers. Only eight states now cling to the old variation. They are all numbered among the less populous commonwealths, and three of them hold their state elections in the first half of the year.

The results of this coincidence of times should be fully appreciated. Few citizens can do three things at once. In passing upon three sets of issues and three blocks of candidates together, the average voter invariably sacrifices one interest by making it support another. Of this fact the seekers of the three classes of offices make the most. It offers a paradise of Yankee bargaining. It extracts the quintessence of concession. The city boss is a contented nonentity in state or national affairs, if the rich municipal spoil be left to him. Politicians of the upper ranks give up local duty to win national power. A great editor belabors the corrupt chief of his party in his home state and flatters the corrupter chief in a state that is far away. Cabinet members or United States senators, whose constituents may dwell among the Rocky Mountains, leave their posts at Washington and hasten to New York city to side with bribe-taking city bosses against members of their own parties whose names are synonyms for probity and patriotism. Between the municipal and the national politician stands the Janus-faced state boss, the *entrepreneur par excellence*. He, if he is uncertain of his hold upon the state, buys for it city and national support, giving in return his promise to be merely a tool in city and national politics. If he has the state's committeemen, legislators, and congressmen all securely in hand, he names mayors, commissioners, senators, ministers, and presidents.

The coincidence of the elections for the three grades produces an advanced type of that union of "deals" called a slate. In its simplest form, a slate is a combination of the seekers of the elective offices in a single grade. The numerous offices of Cleveland, for instance, are distributed among its wards, and the numerous offices of Cuyahoga county among its towns. A south Ohioan whose eye is upon the governorship forms alliances with north Ohioans whose eyes are upon the minor state elective offices. Seven states with vice-presidential "possibilities" cultivate the state with a presidential aspirant. But, with a grand mixture of three elections, the advanced type of the slate appears. Four Ohioans join hands and will be mayor of Cincinnati, governor of Ohio, senator from Ohio, and president from Ohio. Behind these

four Ohioans are innumerable other Ohioans all joining hands and shouting. They will be custodians of mints, penitentiary guards, and street sweepers. There are other states besides Ohio. The manager of a presidential aspirant from one state, approaching the central committee chairman of another state, offers to open the way to the United States Senate for him by giving one of the present senators from the said leader's state a seat in the prospective presidential cabinet. A member of the national House of Representatives wants the speaker to appoint him chairman of the committee on appropriations; the chairman of the party central committee in the state that the prominent member represents wants the support of the prominent member's constituents for the gubernatorial nomination; Mr. Speaker wants the party committee chairman to send to the national convention delegates pledged to the nomination of Mr. Speaker for president of the United States. Madam Rumor presents the interesting spectacle of Mr. Speaker in one Washington hotel, the prominent member in another, and the state committee chairman carrying messages and ultimatums between them!

The main defect of American party organization and procedure, now coming to be plainly recognized, is the mixing of national, state, and municipal concerns. Because of this miscellaneousness, the voter constantly faces a choice between two evils, the party leader is powerfully tempted to do evil that good may come, and the unscrupulous politician fastens himself with his base aims upon true statesmen and beneficent public measures. Nation, state, and city have suffered, but the state more than the nation and the city more than the state.

Present efforts to disentangle the affairs of the three by separate times of action are noticeable. In a presidential year the political parties of several states hold two distinct state conventions, one for national, the other for state nominating purposes. Something has been accomplished by state legislation and constitutional law. Kentucky attains the object, perhaps, as completely as any state. By her constitution of 1892, all state and municipal officers are elected in November of the odd years. In one of these odd years the executive officers of the cities, and

in the other the executive officers of the state, are chosen, all uniformly for quadrennial terms. The tenure of the city councilmen and the state legislators is biennial. New York's constitution of 1895 has attracted attention for its divorcement of the municipal from the higher elections.

If by a state election the choice of the governor and most of the other state officers be understood, the laws show nine variations of the relative times for state and national elections, as follows. The state officers are elected:

1. Quinquennially—Utah.
2. Quadrennially and in the same year with the president—Delaware, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, Washington, and West Virginia; nine states.
3. Quadrennially and in the odd year next after the presidential election—Virginia.
4. Quadrennially and in the even year midway between the presidential elections—California, Kentucky, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming; six states.
5. Quadrennially and in the odd year next before the presidential election—Mississippi, Maryland, Louisiana; three states.
6. Triennially—New Jersey.
7. Biennially and in even years—Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Wisconsin; twenty states.
8. Biennially and in odd years—Ohio, Iowa.
9. Annually—Massachusetts, Rhode Island.

Ten of the nineteen quadrennial states and two of the twenty-two biennial states avoid the presidential year in their state elections. With these may be counted Utah and New Jersey, in which presidential and state elections only occasionally coincide. The prevalent plan is the biennial election in even years. Twenty-five states choose governors on the presidential election day.

In the light of all the foregoing facts, conditions, and

tendencies, a possible completed procedure may be forecast. An ideal time schedule for political action in the United States ought to provide:

(a) *Entirely separate times for the primaries and conventions of the three grades—national, state, and municipal.* Delegates to a state convention should not be selected at a primary meeting which nominates county or city officers. Delegates to a national convention should not be selected by a convention which nominates state officers. Municipal elections should not be held at the same time with state or national elections, nor state elections at the same time with national elections. There should be three distinct chains of political action.

(b) *Coincidence of times for primaries and conventions of a single grade.* (1) Throughout the union, all the primaries for the threefold object of naming congressmen, presidential electors, and delegates to national conventions should be held for all political parties on the same day. Likewise, all state or congressional district conventions for these national nominating purposes should be held for all parties within a given period of one or a few days. And, finally, all national nominating conventions should be held within a given period of days, with a fixed date for opening. (2) Throughout each state, in the election of state officers, all primaries of all political organizations should be held on the same day, all the succeeding county conventions on the same day, and all the succeeding state conventions at the same time. (3) Throughout each county or city, in the election of county or city officers, all the primaries of all political organizations should be held on the same day, and all the succeeding county conventions on the same day.

With such a basis of separate times for the three grades, and uniform times in a single grade, a thoroughgoing schedule for a quadrennial period, 1900–1904, may be suggested, as follows:

FIRST SUB-SCHEDULE.

Throughout the union; for choice of national representatives and presidential electors only.

(1) Primaries, second Tuesday in May, 1900.

(2) County conventions, second Wednesday or Thursday in May, 1900.

(3) Congressional district and state conventions, third Tuesday in May, 1900.

(4) National nominating conventions, first Tuesday in June, 1900.

(5) Election, first Tuesday in November, 1900.

SECOND SUB-SCHEDULE.

Throughout the union; for choice only of county officers, biennial in tenure, and of city officers, biennial in tenure, in cities of twenty thousand inhabitants and over.

(1) Primaries, third Tuesday in March, 1901.

(2) County, city, and ward conventions, third Wednesday in March, 1901.

(3) Election, first Tuesday in May, 1901.

THIRD SUB-SCHEDULE.

Throughout the union; for choice only of state officers, both quadrennial and biennial in tenure.

(1) Primaries, first Tuesday in July, 1901.

(2) County conventions, first Wednesday or Thursday in July, 1901.

(3) State and legislative district conventions, second Tuesday in July, 1901.

(4) Election, first Tuesday in November, 1901.

FOURTH SUB-SCHEDULE.

Throughout the union; for choice only of national representatives, 1902.

(1) Primaries, second Tuesday in May, 1900.

(2) County conventions, second Wednesday or Thursday in May, 1900.

(3) Congressional district and state conventions, third Tuesday in May, 1900.

(4) Election, first Tuesday in November, 1900.

FIFTH SUB-SCHEDULE.

Throughout the union; for choice only of county officers, quadrennial and biennial in tenure, and of city officers, both quadrennial and biennial in tenure, in cities of twenty thousand inhabitants and over, 1903.

- (1) Primaries, third Tuesday in March, 1901.
- (2) County, city, and ward conventions, third Wednesday in March, 1901.
- (3) Election, first Tuesday in May, 1901.

SIXTH SUB-SCHEDULE.

Throughout the union; for choice only of state officers, biennial in tenure, 1903.

- (1) Primaries, first Tuesday in July, 1901.
- (2) County conventions, first Wednesday or Thursday in July, 1901.
- (3) State and legislative district conventions, second Tuesday in July, 1901.
- (4) Election, first Tuesday in November, 1901.

The objections to such a program readily occur. It is novel and radical. Local customs and laws, differences of climate, and other diversities argue against a rigid prescription of time uniformity, exact to the day and throughout the union, for the primaries, conventions, and elections of innumerable counties and cities. So of the election of state officers with one schedule of dates for forty-five distinct campaigns. The election laws of some states proclaim an objection by prohibiting any two parties from holding their primaries on the same day. The only argument advanced for this provision would seem to be that it prevents a clash between rival organizations meeting at the same time. Perhaps as clear and forceful an objection as any is the expense and the extra time incident to separate chains of action for the three grades. The bill for printing, rent, and election officers must be greater, and the voters must go to the polls oftener. The constitution of the United States also stands in the way of a complete realization. Authority to fix the times for the choice

of state, county, and city officers has always been conceded to the state legislatures exclusively. An amendment of the national constitution or a mutual agreement of all state law must be necessary to the choice throughout the United States of all such local officers upon uniform days.

What legislation, then, is practicable? Each state has full power to establish time uniformity for the choice of its state and minor officers, and to provide within its own bounds three distinct chains of action. Uniform dates for the primaries and conventions incident to the election of the national executive and representatives are plainly within the scope of congressional legislation. This gives a powerful national initiative and influence. Just as the laws of 1845 and 1872 have drawn the states to their November Tuesday for the election of city, county, and state officers, so a law requiring all national primaries to be held on the second Tuesday in May would draw state, county, and city primaries together. Congress can forestall such an undesirable tendency by forbidding the holding of any primaries, conventions, and elections for the offices of a state or lesser government at the national polling places or by the conventions nominating national officers. It can require separate election officers, ballot boxes, tickets, conventions, and membership of central committees. It can do away with state conventions for the nomination of presidential electors and the selection of delegates to national conventions, and require that they shall be named by congressional district conventions. Some easily devised method of election may procure the choice of a state's delegates and electors at large as the united act of its congressional district conventions, each voting in a separate place. In this way the state convention can be made an exclusively state function. So, also, Congress can effect some further disentanglement and simplification by enjoining the choice of the delegates to these congressional district conventions by the primaries directly, thereby removing the county convention as a link in national politics.

With national evolution have come the knowledge, experience, and organization which justify a fuller legal regulation of

campaigns. With advances in political and social conditions the need of additional checks upon the political manager has grown. His allies have been the increasingly speedier post-office, railway, and telegraph. His mentor has been the news column of the developing daily paper. His growing skill with these instruments, especially in the interesting interval between one election and the primaries for the next, shows that the initial movement yet belongs to the self-avowed candidate in America as elsewhere. His time for the selfish use of the railway, the post-office, the telegraph, and the news column may be curtailed by simultaneity of popular action. Their increased value for his bargainings may be eliminated by distinct national, state, and city campaigns.

In fixing the dates of a time schedule, the legislator may settle the conflicting interests of politics and other pursuits ; may give to the nation and to the states campaigns short enough to avoid injury to business, and long enough to educate the electors for the intelligent performance of civic duties ; may choose and make permanent such seasons and days as will yield the best weather conditions ; may diminish the interference of campaigns with the sessions of Congress and the duties of congressmen ; may strengthen the control of the people over the political manager, by placing the primary and the nominating convention closer together, and thereby giving a longer interval between the nomination and the election.

Separation of the times for national, state, and municipal action will relieve presidents from sitting down at feasts with keepers of city gambling dens, and congressmen from campaigning with bullet-headed candidates for state legislatures. It will remedy that interference of political issues which repudiates a president's war policy, because a state administration has been mixed up in canal frauds. It will permit the average citizen to vote with his next-door neighbor for municipal ownership without encouraging that neighbor's tariff or monetary views. It will secure individual attention for each of the three governments. Three distinct types of healthy leadership will emerge. The champion of expanded commerce will not need to clash with the champion

of building and loan associations or with the champion of clean streets.

Time uniformity of action in each separate governmental grade—national, state, or city—prevents repeating or colonizing within each party, and restricts each citizen to the caucus of but one party for any given election. By making the formation of slates more difficult, it encourages the choice of candidates on personal rather than on geographical grounds. It secures equality of opportunity among the aspirants for each office. The unscrupulous cannot avail themselves of snap methods. The still hunt that unduly lengthens the campaign backward from the election is no longer a factor. The contest is exalted to the free plain of persuasion and reason. All the aspirants must come to the line and start fair. "Party harmony" is promoted, since Americans acquiesce readily in a fair defeat. Time uniformity secures equality among political parties. Partisanship loses force when all parties act simultaneously. They feel that, however much they may differ as to means, they are honestly aiming for the same end. Each cannot ask what rival parties have declared, and therefore must ask what is best for the state. Each makes the most of the primary and of the convention, because it knows not just how much its prospective opponents are making of them. Time uniformity secures equality of opportunity among states, and among counties. The unfair leverage of the "moral effect" vanishes. Each county and each state follows its own judgment. The telegraphic momentum of one commonwealth does not divert the course of another. A single county with a million people does not overawe and rout in detachments numerous small counties, each with some twenty thousand farmer folk.

The economic aspects of a simultaneous choice of all state officers, or of all county and city officers, throughout the union are worthy of thought. The interruption of business and commerce would be less if the primaries preliminary to the choice of governors in New York and Pennsylvania were held on the same day. The election of mayors in Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo on a single day would operate upon the

trade among the cities of the great lakes in the same equitable manner as does the keeping by them of a common seventh day of rest.

The coinciding action of multitudes of electors moves the patriotic imagination. Let the legislator devote a single period to municipal elections, and let a hundred great cities elect at one and the same time—what a quickening of civic life! What an impulse of emulative rivalries! What a gathering of scattered, confused efforts into one steady, distinct movement!

With certainly known and regularly recurring days for the primaries, everybody can take a well-timed preliminary interest in their problems. With time uniformity, whatever hectic spice may be lost to elections through restraint upon the gambling politician is replaced a thousand fold by the increased freedom of the voter. Democracy's danger lies not in an excess of isolated, but in an excess of imitative action. Independence of judgment for the voting rank and file supplies to politics its true and desirable variety.

In fine, intelligent planning of the times for political action may do much to place both men and measures upon their independent merits, or to conserve and to extend that equality upon which the American republic is founded, an equality of voters, of candidates, of political parties, of counties, and of states.

L. G. McCONACHIE.

CHICAGO.